Toward Understanding the Effect of Nuclear Waste Glass Composition on Sulfur Solubility

John D. Vienna[1], Dong-Sang Kim[1], Isabelle S. Muller[2], Greg F. Piepel[1], and Albert A. Kruger[3]

[1]*Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA 99352*

[2]*The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. 20064*

[3]*U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection, Richland, WA 99354*

Abstract

The concentration of sulfur in nuclear waste glass melter feed must be maintained below the point where salt accumulates on the melt surface. The allowable concentrations may range from 0.37 to over 2.05 weight percent (of SO_3 on a calcined oxide basis) depending on the composition of the melter feed and processing conditions. If the amount of sulfur exceeds the melt tolerance level, a molten salt will accumulate, which may upset melter operations and potentially shorten the useful life of the melter. At the Hanford site, relatively conservative limits have been placed on sulfur loading in melter feed, which in turn significantly increases the amount of glass that will be produced. Crucible-scale sulfur solubility data and scaled melter sulfur tolerance data have been collected on simulated Hanford waste glasses over the last 15 years. These data were compiled and analyzed. A model was developed to predict the solubility of SO_3 in glass based on 252 simulated Hanford low-activity waste (LAW) glass compositions. This model represents the data well, accounting for over 85% of the variation in data, and was well validated. The model was also found to accurately predict the tolerance for sulfur in melter feed for 13 scaled melter tests of simulated LAW glasses. The model can be used to help estimate glass volumes and make informed decisions on process options. The model also gives quantitative estimates of component concentration effects on sulfur solubility. The components that most increase sulfur solubility are Li_2O >

$V_2O_5 > CaO \approx P_2O_5 > Na_2O \approx B_2O_3 > K_2O$. The components that most decrease sulfur solubility are $Cl > Cr_2O_3 > Al_2O_3 > ZrO_2 \approx SnO_2 > Others \approx SiO_2$. The order of component effects is similar to previous literature data, in most cases.

I. Introduction

The process deployed for nuclear waste glass vitrification in the U.S. includes feeding a slurry mixture of the nuclear waste and glass forming additives on top of a molten glass melt within ceramic lined melters. The melter feed slurry dries on the melt surface to form a cold-cap, which is heated by the glass melt and reacts to form several intermediate products and ultimately forms the liquid silicate melt. Melter feeds with excess concentrations of certain anions will form a salt that accumulates on the melt surface. This salt contains primarily alkali- and alkaline-earth-sulfates, -phosphates, -chromates, -pertechnetates, and -halides. The salt is corrosive to those melter components that contact it such as bubblers, thermowells, and even melt-line refractories, plus it increases the volatility of technetium and cesium.[1, 2, 3, 4] A glass melt saturated in salt components may also form a water soluble salt in the canistered glass which preferentially contains technetium, chromium, and cesium.[1, 3] Therefore, salt accumulation in the melter should be avoided. Avoiding salt formation in the melter requires either 1) conservative empirical limits on salt-forming components such as sulfur, chromium, and halides or 2) a model able to predict the practical limit of salt solubility in the melter as a function of melter feed composition.

Sulfur can be incorporated into silicate glass melts in a range of oxidation states from sulfate (SO_4^{2-}) to sulfide (S^{2-}).[5, 6, 7, 8] In U.S. nuclear waste glass melts, sulfur occurs primarily in the form of a sulfate ion.[9, 10, 11, 12, 13] However, under extreme reducing conditions, sulfide may be generated in waste glass melts.[9, 14] In the silicate melt, sulfate ions form primarily isolated tetrahedra associated with either alkali or alkaline earth ions.[10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19] The molten salt identified in U.S. waste glass melters primarily contained sulfur

in the sulfate state. This salt is primarily sodium sulfate with smaller amounts of other alkali, alkaline

earths, chromate, phosphate, chloride, and fluoride (likely also molybdate, pertechnetate, and other

oxyanionic salts).[4, 20, 21, 22, 23]

There are kinetic aspects to sulfate incorporation into the melt. Generally, an oxyanionic salt is formed in

the cold-cap that is dominated by volatile salts such as nitrates, nitrites, and hydroxides (sometimes called

primary melt).[24, 25] As the temperature of the salt increases, the major components (nitrates, nitrites,

hydroxides, etc.) of the primary melt decompose and/or volatilize leaving the less volatile salt

components (sulfates, phosphates, etc.).[26] The resulting salt is partially incorporated into the silicate melt,

is partially volatilized, and may partially accumulate as a salt segregated from the cold-cap. The fraction

of sulfur that volatilizes is highly dependent on both the contents of sulfur and reducing agents in the

batch.[3, 22, 27, 28] Additionally, sulfate dissolved in the silicate melt may separate from the melt under

conditions that change its solubility. The result of these kinetic processes is that salt segregation/

accumulation may occur at sulfur concentrations well below the thermodynamic solubility of sulfate in

the melt composition and temperature.[3, 20, 26] The solubility of sulfate in silicate melts can be readily

measured in the laboratory with standard equipment and approaches. However, it's not currently clear

how thermodynamic solubility of sulfate correlates to the concentration of sulfate in the melter feed that

will accumulate as a salt during normal melter processing. Such accumulation may be determined by

kinetic factors. Yet, it can be theorized that the higher the thermodynamic solubility, the higher the

amount of sulfate that can be fed to the melter without accumulating a salt phase.[28, 29] This challenge is

addressed later in this paper.

Several attempts have been made to correlate the propensity for salt accumulation as a function of melter

feed composition. These attempts invariably start with a solubility limit or tolerance for sulfate ion

(SO_4^{2-}) or sulfur trioxide (SO_3) as a function of melt or melter feed composition. Papadopoulos

developed a model of SO_3 solubility in soda-lime-silicate melts based on the estimated concentration of

non-bridging oxygen (NBO) per tetrahedron.[30] Li et al. adopted the Papadopoulos approach to nuclear

waste glasses.[31] Ooura and Hanada found that for 1) binary alkali-silicate glasses, the ratio of NBO to

bridging oxygen predicted well the sulfate solubility, and 2) ternary alkaline earth-alkali-silicate glasses,

the impact of alkaline-earth oxide concentration on sulfate solubility was linear and the slope was

dependent on the thermal decomposition equilibrium constant of the metal sulfate.[32] Pelton applied a

CALPHAD methodology (using Reddy-Blander model) to fit composition effects on sulfate solubility in

five component silicate melts.[33] Pegg et al. suggested a solubility product-type relationship between Na_2O

and SO_3 in the waste glass melt such that the maximum tolerance to sulfur in the melter is given by:

$$g_{Na_2O} \times g_{SO_3} \leq 0.0005$$

where g_i is the ith component mass fraction in glass.[3] Schreiber and Stokes propose that glass basicity and

oxygen potential will dictate sulfate solubility.[34] Peeler et al. developed a conservative single-value limit

of 0.6 wt% (as SO_4^{-2}) for application to the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF),[21, 35] which may

be increased slightly by adding V_2O_5.[36] Vienna et al. determined a similar single-value limit for Hanford

low-activity waste (LAW) glass of 0.8 wt% SO_3.[29] Jantzen et al. correlated the salt formation limit in

sealed crucible tests of simulated DWPF glasses to viscosity of the melt which in turn was correlated to

NBO concentrations.[2] Manara et al. correlated the sulfate solubility to the ratio of alkali to boron

concentrations and attributed the impact of V_2O_5 to increasing sulfate solubility and increasing the

kinetics of sulfur incorporation through depolymerization of the borosilicate network.[37] Bingham

correlated the effects of component concentrations on the SO_3 solubility and incorporation in

multicomponent phosphate glasses to the field strength of the components and proposed that the same

correlation would be valid for silicate-based melts.[38, 39] Billings and Fox found that increasing CaO and

B_2O_3 in frit and lowering alkali increase the sulfur retention in sealed crucible tests with simulated DWPF

glasses.[40]

Overall, the literature contains some conflicting results, but it is clear that SO_3 solubility is highly compositionally dependent. Nuclear waste vitrification at the Hanford site requires near real-time glass formulation to meet project goals and complete the tank waste cleanup mission in an effective manner. To implement such a strategy, a quantitative model is needed to predict SO_3 tolerance based on melter feed composition. None of the approaches discussed above have been found appropriate for implementation at Hanford. This paper documents the initial attempt to develop a model to predict SO_3 tolerance in Hanford low-activity waste (LAW) glasses based on melter feed composition.

II. Experimental Data

Several series of experiments were performed to measure the solubility of SO_3 in simulated Hanford LAW glasses at crucible scale and to measure the tolerance for SO_3 in the feed by scaled melter tests. This data and the associated experimental methods are summarized here and are also documented in more detail in U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) project reports by the Catholic University of America. These data are summarized below.

Saturation Method

The solubility of SO_3 in simulated waste glass melts was measured by supersaturating the melt with Na_2SO_4 in the amount of several wt% (typically 4 wt%) of SO_3 in the glass if 100% was retained. The mixtures of glass powder and Na_2SO_4 were melted at 1150°C in Pt alloy crucibles with a cover in resistance-heated furnaces. After a melting period of roughly 1 hour, the melt was cooled naturally to room temperature. Then the glass, covered with a sulfate salt layer, was recovered for examination. After washing the broken glass chunks to remove the segregated salt, the glass was ground and washed in dilute nitric acid to remove remaining salt inclusions. The composition of the glass was then analyzed using X-ray fluorescence (XRF) to determine SO_3 concentration and confirm accurate glass batching.

The SO_3 concentrations measured by this method are labeled $w_{SO_3}^{Sat}$. The ground and washed glass was remelted, which tends to modify slightly the composition of the glass, particularly for volatile components. Using Na_2SO_4 to supersaturate the melt minimizes any sodium deviation.

Bubbling Method

The solubility of SO_3 in simulated waste glass melts was measured using a gas bubbling system. The glasses were melted at 1150°C in a Pt alloy crucible under flowing mixtures of SO_2, O_2, and N_2 to achieve the desired partial pressure of SO_3 (p_{SO_3}). Samples of the glass melt were taken and analyzed for SO_3 concentration by XRF as a function of p_{SO_3}. The experiments were continued until the melt was saturated with SO_3 (that is, the concentration of SO_3 in the glass no longer changed with p_{SO_3}). Saturation of the melt often occurred later than the formation of a segregated salt layer on the surface of the melt, so, the glass was ground and washed with dilute nitric acid prior to XRF to remove any salt inclusions. The SO_3 solubilities measured by this method are labeled $w_{SO_3}^{Bubb}$.

Scaled Melter Tests

Melter tests were performed in the Duramelter (DM)-10, -100, and -1200 melter systems. These melter systems are scaled, prototypical Hanford melters with Inconel Joule-heating electrodes, high-chromium refractory liners, and air bubblers. The simulated nuclear waste was blended with prototypic Hanford glass forming chemicals in ratios to obtain the target glass composition. The resulting slurry feed was fed onto the top of the bubbled melt pool where it reacted to form the molten silicate melt and, in the case of excessive SO_3, a molten salt. The nominal melt pool operating temperature was maintained at roughly 1150°C and the plenum temperature ranged between roughly 500°C and 700°C. The bubbling rates of the smaller melters were adjusted to maintain a nominal glass processing rate of roughly 2000 $kg_{glass} \cdot m^{-2} \cdot d^{-1}$. Sugar was added to the melts to facilitate the decomposition of nitrate and nitrite components of the waste simulant using a fixed ratio of 0.75 moles of organic carbon to each mole of NO_x in the melter feed.

6

This reductant ratio and the air bubbling maintained the iron oxidation state of the glass melt well below 10% Fe(II)/Fe(Total), ensuring sulfur was incorporated as sulfate. The presence or absence of an accumulated salt was determined by 1) reaching steady state melting conditions with the feed, 2) stop feeding and allowing the cold-cap to completely react into the melt, 3) probing the surface with a rod to determine if salt was present. The concentration of SO_3 was then changed to narrow the maximum concentration that did not form a salt and the minimum concentration of SO_3 that did form a persistent salt. The SO_3 tolerances measured by this method are labeled $w_{SO_3}^{Melt}$.

Data Summary

The resulting data are summarized in Table 1. The composition region covered by these 264 glasses is summarized in Table 2. There is generally good concentration distribution for each of these components, with a few exceptions:

- One glass (LAWA55) contained 7.9 wt% BaO while the next highest concentration was 0.01%.

- One glass (LAWA58) contained 5 wt% Bi_2O_3, no other glass contained any.

- One glass (LAWA62) contained 3 wt% CoO, no other glass contained any.

- One glass (LAWA63) contained 3 wt% CuO, no other glass contained any.

- One glass (LAWABPS) contained 2 wt% each of Gd_2O_3 and La_2O_3, only one other glass contained any Gd_2O_3 and one other glass contained any La_2O_3.

- One glass (LAWA92) contained 7.9 wt% Gd_2O_3.

- One glass (LAWA91) contained 7.9 wt% La_2O_3.

- One glass (LAWA61) contained 2.5 wt% MnO while the next highest concentration was 0.06%.

- One glass (LAWA59) contained 3 wt% Sb_2O_3, no other glass contained any.

- Two glasses (LAWA54 and LAWA72) contained 7.9 wt% SrO while the next highest concentration was 0.08%.

These 11 glasses with extreme component concentrations were excluded from the modeling dataset, leaving 253 glasses. The resulting component concentration ranges are also summarized in Table 2.

Figure 1 shows the pairwise comparisons of major component concentrations for the 253 glass compositions in the dataset as a scatterplot matrix. The data do not provide full coverage of the space for some pairs of components because as glass formulations evolved, some components were added to replace other components. As examples, older glasses contain significant Fe_2O_3 and TiO_2 while newer LAW glasses don't, and newer glasses contain significant concentrations of SnO_2 and V_2O_5 while older glasses don't.

Sufficient glass compositions had their SO_3 solubilities/tolerances measured by the three different methods to permit comparing the results. Figure 2 compares the melter tolerance for SO_3 ($w_{SO_3}^{Melt}$, the value that truly needs to be controlled during glass production) with the results from the two crucible melt techniques ($w_{SO_3}^{Bubb}$ and $w_{SO_3}^{Sat}$). The $w_{SO_3}^{Bubb}$ correlated strongly with $w_{SO_3}^{Melt}$. Correlating $w_{SO_3}^{Bubb}$ to $w_{SO_3}^{Melt}$ resulted in a line with the intercept and slope not being statistically different from 0.0 and 1.0, respectively, and an $R^2 = 0.919$. Likewise, correlating $w_{SO_3}^{Sat}$ to $w_{SO_3}^{Melt}$ resulted in a line with $R^2 = 0.819$. The slope was not statistically different from 1.0, but there was a statistically significant offset (or intercept) of $w_{SO_3}^{Melt} - w_{SO_3}^{Sat} = 0.2115$ wt%. These strong correlations between results from crucible scale testing and melter testing suggest that, under the conditions used for these tests and the composition region investigated, solubility data from crucible testing can be used to predict SO_3 tolerance in the melter feed. Hence, the much more abundant crucible scale data can be used to predict the effect of glass composition on SO_3 tolerance in the melter.

III. Model Development

To correlate melt composition to the SO_3 tolerance, the data were modified to form a modeling dataset. Because of the scarcity of $w_{SO_3}^{Melt}$ data (13 compositions), it was decided to perform the modeling on crucible scale data only and reserve melter scale data for validation. Because bubbling solubility data matched melter tolerance more closely, the modeling data set used $w_{SO_3}^{Bubb}$ for any glass with bubbling data available (38 data points) and $w_{SO_3}^{Sat}$ + offset (= 0.2115) for all other glasses (215 data points). The symbol w_{SO_3} is used to represent both the $w_{SO_3}^{Bubb}$ and $w_{SO_3}^{Sat}$+offset data. Each target glass composition was normalized after removing SO_3 from the composition for three reasons: 1) the SO_3 obtained in the glass was substantially different from the target, 2) the basis for target SO_3 was different for the two methods used, and 3) w_{SO_3} was the independent variable being modeled. The following equation was used to normalize the compositions.

$$n_i = \frac{g_i}{1 - g_{SO_3}},$$

where g_i is the ith component mass fraction in glass and n_i is the normalized mass fraction of the ith component so that the normalized concentrations of all components (i = 1, 2, …, q) except SO_3 sum to 1.

The resulting dataset of 253 glass compositions was used to develop quantitative models between n_i and w_{SO_3}. A partial quadratic mixture model[50] was found to be the most successful at both fitting the w_{SO_3} data and being validated by data not used to fit the model. This model has the general form

$$w_{SO_3}^{Pred} = \sum_{i=1}^{q} s_i\, n_i + selected\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{q} s_{ii}\, n_i^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{q-1} \sum_{k=j+1}^{q} s_{jk} n_j n_k \right\}$$

where $w_{SO_3}^{Pred}$ = predicted SO_3 solubility (in wt%),

q = number of components in the waste glass, except for SO_3,

n_i = normalized (after removing SO_3) mass fraction of the ith component,

s_i = coefficient of the ith component,

s_{ii} = coefficient for the ith component squared,

s_{jk} = coefficient for the jth and k^{th} components crossproduct.

The data for the 253 simulated LAW glasses were initially fit to the first-order form of the model (i.e., s_{ii} and s_{jk} values equal to zero) to determine which components had a significant impact on w_{SO_3}. JMP® 10.0.2 software (SAS Institute Inc., Cary NC) was used to fit the first-order model initially using all components with a maximum concentration (in at least one glass) of 0.2 wt% or greater. The component effects (slope of $w_{SO_3}^{Pred}$ vs n_i) and their uncertainties were calculated based on the data centroid composition (given in Table 2) using Eqs. (12) to (16) of Piepel.[51] The components with the least significant slopes were removed from the fit and included into a grouped "Others" component along with the components with concentrations less than 0.2 wt%. Slope significance was judged by the overlap of the 90% confidence interval about the line of $w_{SO_3}^{Pred}$ vs n_i and the zero-effect line. The component with the least significant overlap was removed first and the model refit. This process was repeated until R_P^2 statistics began to increase. The R_P^2 statistic represents the fraction of variability in the w_{SO_3} data values accounted for by the fitted model, where each data point is "left out of the fit" in evaluating how well the model predicts that data point. R_P^2 estimates the fraction of variability that would be accounted for in predicting new observations drawn from the same composition space. The order of components moved to Others was (from least significance to highest): Fe_2O_3, ZnO, MgO, TiO_2, and F. This left a first-order model containing: Li_2O, CaO, V_2O_5, Na_2O, B_2O_3, Al_2O_3, Cl, Cr_2O_3, ZrO_2, K_2O, P_2O_5, SnO_2, SiO_2 and Others (in order of significance). The 90% confidence intervals for the $w_{SO_3}^{Pred}$ vs n_i lines of SiO_2 and SnO_2 crossed zero (along with that of Others). However, it was decided to retain separate model terms for SiO_2 and SnO_2.

The squared terms (n_i^2) and crossproduct terms ($n_j n_k$) used in the model fit were selected to give the best combination of model fit and model validation statistics while minimizing the number of second-order terms. Four candidate models were selected based primarily on their R_P^2 statistics and general knowledge of component effects on w_{SO_3}: 1) a 14-term first-order model, 2) a 14-term first-order model plus a Li$_2$O×Li$_2$O term, 3) a 14-term first-order model plus Li$_2$O×Li$_2$O and CaO×Cr$_2$O$_3$ terms, and 4) a 12-term first-order model (without K$_2$O and SnO$_2$ terms) plus a Li$_2$O×Li$_2$O term. The fourth model excluded K$_2$O and SnO$_2$ because they were the least significant terms when the Li$_2$O×Li$_2$O term was added. Each of the four candidate models was fitted and then validated (as described below). The model with the best validation performance was then selected as the final model. Four data points were consistently found to be outliers (with residuals greater than three standard deviations) -- LAWA76, LAWB102, LAWB104, and LAWB67S4. When they were removed from the various fits, the fit statistics were improved but the model coefficients remained almost unchanged. An examination of their compositions and w_{SO_3} values didn't show any trends. It was therefore decided to leave the outliers in the modeling dataset.

Models were also fitted to composition data converted into mole fractions of components. The significant terms and model statistics were found to be roughly the same. Slightly higher R_P^2 statistics were obtained from the mass-fraction models, so those models are reported in this paper.

Table 3 lists the final model components and coefficients, where it is seen that 15 terms appear in the model (the components not listed as specific terms are included in the Others component) and that only one quadratic term (Li$_2$O×Li$_2$O) appears. Table 4 lists the summary statistics for the model fit, where it is seen that the values for R^2, R_A^2, and R_P^2 are very close, suggesting that there are no unnecessary model terms and no significantly outlying or influential data points.

Figure 3 shows a plot of the predicted ($w_{SO_3}^{Pred}$) and measured (w_{SO_3}) experimental data with 90%

prediction intervals. Prediction intervals that overlap the 45° line indicate that the model predicts w_{SO_3}

within the uncertainty of the model. The corresponding 90% prediction intervals generally overlap the

45° line, although the model tends to slightly underpredict w_{SO_3} values above roughly 1.3 wt%. A slight

underprediction is not a concern for the intended use of the model as it will result in conservative

formulations.

Two approaches were used to validate the model in Table 3, namely 1) subsetting the dataset used to fit

the model (i.e., cross-validation), and 2) validating with data not used in model fitting. To subset the

data, they were first sorted by $w_{SO_3}^{Pred}$ values. The data were then numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 1, 2, … to split

them into five representative groups each containing roughly 20% of the data. The same model form

(including the same set of terms) was fit to each group of four of the five subsets of data and used to

predict SO$_3$ solubility in the remaining validation subset. Table 5 summarizes the results of this model

validation exercise. The R^2 value for the fit of each subset model are all close to each other at

approximately 0.89. The validation R^2 (R_V^2) values range from 0.84 to 0.91, which are sufficiently close

to the model fit R^2 values in Table 5 and the R^2 value in Table 4. The average R_V^2 value of 0.87 in Table 5

is also very close to the R_P^2 value of 0.87 in Table 4. Based on the results of this validation approach, it is

reasonable to expect that 87% of the variation in newly generated data within the same composition space

will be accounted for by this model. The variation not accounted for by the model can be addressed using

statistical methods for calculating the uncertainty in model predictions.

For the second validation approach, the model was used to predict the maximum concentration of SO$_3$

from scaled melter tests that did not accumulate a salt layer ($w_{SO_3}^{Melt}$). These data were not used to fit the

model and hence serve to validate it. More importantly, $w_{SO_3}^{Melt}$ is the property that must be predicted to

successfully operate the Hanford LAW glass melters. Figure 4 compares the model-predicted $w_{SO_3}^{Pred}$

values with the measured $w_{SO_3}^{Melt}$ values for the 13 glasses having such data. A good correlation is obvious from the figure with an R_V^2 for this dataset of 0.925. The root mean squared prediction error (RMSPE) = 0.086 is slightly smaller than the root mean squared error (RMSE) = 0.115 from the model fit.

Two conclusions can be drawn from the results of the two validation approaches. First, it is clear that a model based on crucible-scale solubility data ($w_{SO_3}^{Sat}$+offset and $w_{SO_3}^{Bubb}$) can be used to predict the maximum allowable SO_3 in the melter feed ($w_{SO_3}^{Melt}$). Second, the model predicts w_{SO_3} for data not used to fit the model as well as it predicts data used to fit the model.

$w_{SO_3}^{Pred}$ values were calculated for the 11 glasses removed from the model dataset as composition outliers. The w_{SO_3} values for all 11 data points were underpredicted, while the 90% prediction intervals overlapped the w_{SO_3} values for 9 of the 11 points. The remaining two glasses were significantly underpredicted – LAWA55 with 8 wt% BaO and LAWA54 with 7.9 wt% SrO. This trend matches previous expectations that the alkaline earth components should increase w_{SO_3}, which isn't well predicted by the Others term (that slightly decreases $w_{SO_3}^{Pred}$).

To apply a SO_3 solubility model in controlling a vitrification plant, the prediction uncertainty must be calculated and applied. The prediction uncertainty can be applied in one of two ways: 1) a simultaneous upper confidence interval (SUCI), or 2) an individual upper confidence interval (UCI). A SUCI provides a specified confidence (e.g., 90%) that the true mean property values for all predictions made with the model at different glass compositions would be below the SUCI value. The uncertainty portion of a SUCI is calculated using

$$U_{SUCI} = \sqrt{pF_{1-\alpha,(p,N-p)}\mathbf{n}^T\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{n}}$$

where

U_{SUCI} = prediction uncertainty for $w_{SO_3}^{Pred}$, which is a model uncertainty half-width for a SUCI

with (1-α)100% confidence

p = number of model terms (15)

N = number of data points used to fit the model (253)

$F_{1-\alpha(p,N-p)}$ = (1-α)100% upper percentile of an F-distribution with p numerator degrees of freedom and

N-p denominator degrees of freedom

α = small fraction typically less than or equal to 0.1 used to represent the probability that a

(1−α)100% SUCI does not contain the true value for at least one of the compositions to

which the model is applied

n = vector of values for the set of p (15) model terms, which consist of 14 n_i values

(component normalized mass fractions in glass) plus $n_{Li_2O}^2$

Σ = $p \times p$ variance-covariance matrix for the model coefficients.

The variance-covariance matrix, **Σ**, is calculated for the estimated coefficients of a model fitted by

regression according to $\mathbf{\Sigma} = s[\mathbf{G^T G}]^{-1}$, where s is the RMSE for the model fit and **G** is the matrix of

vectors **n** for all the data points (glasses) used to fit the model. The variance-covariance matrix for the

model of Table 3 is given in Table 6.

An UCI provides (1−α)100% confidence that the true mean property value for the given glass

composition would be below the UCI value. The uncertainty portion of a UCI is calculated by

$$U_{UCI} = t_{1-\alpha,N-p}\sqrt{\mathbf{n^T \Sigma n}}$$

where

U_{UCI} = prediction uncertainty for $w_{SO_3}^{Pred}$, which is a model uncertainty half-width for a UCI with

(1−α)100% confidence

$t_{1-α,N-p}$ = (1−α)100% upper percentile of a t-distribution with N–p degrees of freedom

and all other notation is as defined previously.

IV. Discussion

A model of SO_3 solubility in waste glasses was empirically fit to simulated Hanford LAW glass

composition data. Not only were the model coefficients empirically fit, but also to some extent the model

form was selected empirically. Figure 5 is a response-trace plot (sometimes referred to as a "spider-

plot")[52] that shows the effects of individual component concentration changes on $w_{SO_3}^{Pred}$. Each curve on

the figure spans the range of the corresponding component concentration in the database and is centered

on the average composition of the test data used to fit the model (i.e., the centroid). The centroid

composition and calculated component effects (slopes) at that centroid are listed in Table 7. The slopes

for all components in the model (except n_{Li_2O}) are nearly constant, while the slope for n_{Li_2O} depends on

its concentration. The slope for n_{Li_2O} at the centroid (7.7) is near the low end of the range of n_{Li_2O} slopes

(1.6 to 32.1). Several sets of components have similar slopes (ZrO_2 and SnO_2, SiO_2 and Others, B_2O_3 and

Na_2O, and P_2O_5 and CaO). This allows for the possibility of combining components to reduce the number

of model terms if desired.

The strong positive effects of Li_2O, V_2O_5, and CaO on w_{SO_3} have been reported previously.[3, 28, 29, 37] P_2O_5

was reported previously[53] to help increase SO_3 solubility in the melt at lower concentrations and then

decrease the solubility at higher concentrations. However, the model suggests a constant improvement for P_2O_5 concentrations up to 3 wt%. Na_2O and B_2O_3 were found to moderately improve solubility. The very strong tendencies for Cl and Cr_2O_3 to reduce SO_3 solubility are understandable due to their participation in the molten salt. These components have been found to form molten salts even in the absence of SO_3. It is anticipated that MoO_3 will likewise promote salt formation, but it was not included as a significant component in the test data used for the work in this paper. ZrO_2 and SnO_2 moderately decrease SO_3 solubility. Finally, it's interesting to note that despite a broad variation in MgO concentrations (up to 10 wt%) and F concentrations (up to 3 wt%), no impacts on SO_3 solubility were evident; hence these components were included in the Others component.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

An empirical model was developed to predict the solubility of SO_3 in simulated Hanford LAW glasses. This model was found to account for over 87% of the variation in measured solubility (ranging from 0.37 to 2.05 wt% as SO_3 in glass). The model performed equally well when subsets of the data were held out for validation, yielding R_V^2 values roughly the same (0.87) as R^2. The SO_3 solubility model was shown to predict well the tolerance for SO_3 in melter feed without salt segregation (at least for the 13 compositions under the processing conditions tested) with $R_V^2 = 0.93$ and a RMSPE = 0.086 slightly below the model fit RMSE = 0.115 (which is good). The effects of component concentrations on SO_3 solubility predicted by the empirical model match many of the general trends previously reported in the literature. For example Li_2O, CaO, and V_2O_5 all increase SO_3 tolerance while Cl and Cr_2O_3 decrease it. Some unexpected composition effects were also noticed. For example MgO and F showed little impact.

VI. Acknowledgments

16

VII. References

1. J. C. Marra, M. K. Andrews, and R. F. Schumacher, "Vitrification in the Presence of Molten Salts," pp. 401-08. in Ceramic Transactions, Vol. 45. Edited by D. F. Bickford, S. O. Bates, V. Jain, and G. L. Smith. American Ceramic Society, 1994.

2. C. M. Jantzen, M. E. Smith, and D. K. Peeler, "Dependency of Sulfate Solubility on Melt Composition and Melt Polymerization," pp. 141-52. in Ceramic Transactions, Vol. 168. Edited by J. D. Vienna, C. C. Herman, and S. L. Marra. American Ceramic Society, 2005.

3. I. L. Pegg, H. Gan, I. S. Muller, D. A. McKeown, and K. S. Matlack, "Summary of Preliminary Results on Enhanced Sulfate Incorporation During Vitrification of LAW Feeds." ORP-54333. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection, Richland, WA, 2008.

4. G. K. Sullivan, M. H. Langowski, and P. Hrma, "Sulfate Segregation in Vitrification of Simulated Hanford Nuclear Waste," pp. 187-93. in Ceramic Transactions, Vol. 61. Edited by V. Jain and R. A. Palmer, 1996.

5. D. S. Goldman, "REDOX and Sulfur Solubility in Glass Melts." in International Congress on Glass. Charleroi, Belgium, 1985.

6. H. D. Schreiber, B. K. Kochanowski, C. W. Schreiber, A. B. Morgan, M. T. Coolbaugh, and T. G. Dunlap, "Composition Dependance of REDOX Equilibria in Sodium Silicate Glasses," *J. Non-Cryst. Sol.,* 177 340-46 (1994).

7. H. D. Schreiber, S. J. Kozak, and P. G. Leonhard, "Sulfur Chemistry in A Glass-Forming Borosilicate Melt," *Am Ceram Soc Bull,* 64[10] 1339-39 (1985).

8. H. D. Schreiber, S. J. Kozak, P. G. Leonhard, and K. K. McManus, "Sulfur Chemistry in a Borosilicate Melt, Part I. REDOX Equilibria and Solubility," *Glastechnische Berichte,* 60[12] 389-98 (1987).

9. S. O. Bates, "A Letter Report Summarizing the Sulfate/REDOX Relationship to Glass Melting Chemistry and Behavior." HWVP Baseline Milestone 020207A. Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, WA, 1985.

10. J. G. Darab, H. Li, D. W. Matson, P. A. Smith, and R. K. MacCrone, "Chemical and Structural Elucidation of Minor Components in Simulated Hanford Low-Level Waste Glasses." in Applications of Synchrotron Radiation in Industry, Chemical, and Materials Science. Edited by L. J. Terminello, K. L. D'Amico, and D. K. Shuh. Plenum, 1996.

11. H. D. Schreiber, C. W. Schreiber, E. D. Sisk, and S. J. Kozak, "Sulfur Systematics in Model Glass Compositions from West Valley." in Ceramic Transactions, Vol. 45. Edited by D. F. Bickford, S. O. Bates, V. Jain, and G. L. Smith. American Ceramic Society, 1994.

12. D. A. McKeown, I. S. Muller, H. Gan, I. L. Pegg, and C. A. Kendziora, "Raman Studies of Sulfur in Borosilicate Waste Glasses," pp. 451-57. in Ceramic Transactions, Vol. 119. Edited by D. R. Spearing, G. L. Smith, and R. L. Putnum. American Ceramic Society, 2001.

13. D. A. McKeown, I. S. Muller, H. Gan, I. L. Pegg, and W. C. Stolte, "Determination of sulfur environments in borosilicate waste glasses using X-ray absorption near-edge spectroscopy," *Journal of Non-Crystalline Solids,* 333 74–84 (2004).

14. J. M. Perez, L. J. Ethridge, D. S. Goldman, R. W. Goles, R. D. Peters, N. L. Scharnhorst, and G. J. Sevigny, "West Valley Waste Vitrification Experiment, PSCM-16 Summary." Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, WA, 1983.

15. D. A. McKeown, I. S. Muller, H. Gan, I. L. Pegg, and C. A. Kendziora, "Raman Studies of Sulfur in Borosilicate Waste Glasses: Sulfate Environments," *Journal of Non-Crystalline Solids,* 288 191-99 (2001).

16. R. K. Mishra, K. V. Sudarsan, P. Sengupta, R. K. Vatsa, A. K. Tyagi, C. P. Kaushik, D. Das, and K. Raj, "Role of Sulfate in Structural Modifications of Sodium Barium Borosilicate Glasses Developed for Nuclear Waste Immobilization," *Journal of American Ceramic Society,* 91[12] 3903-07 (2008).

17. W. Grünewald, G. Roth, S. Hilpp, W. Tobie, A. Salimi, S. Weisenburger, and B. Brendebach, "Laboratory-scale Development and Technical Demonstration of Borosilicate Glass Tailored for Vitrification of High Sulfur Bearing HLLW," pp. 392-401. in Global 2009. Paris, France, 2009.

18. M. Lenoir, A. Grandjean, S. Poissonnet, and D. R. Neuville, "Quantitation of sulfate solubility in borosilicate glasses using Raman spectroscopy," *Journal of Non-Crystalline Solids,* 355 1468-73 (2009).

19. P. A. Bingham, A. J. Connelly, R. J. Hand, N. C. Hyatt, P. A. Northrup, R. A. Mori, P. Glatzel, M. Kavcic, M. Zitnik, K. Bucar, and R. Edge, "A multi-spectroscopic investigation of sulphur speciation in silicate glasses and slags," *Glass Technol-Part A,* 51[2] 63-80 (2010).

20. W. K. Kot, H. Gan, and I. L. Pegg, "Sulfur Incorporation in Waste Glass Melts of Various Compositions," pp. 441-49. in Ceramics Transactions*,* Vol. 107. Edited by G. T. Chandler and X. D. Feng. American Ceramics Society, 1999.

21. D. K. Peeler, C. C. Herman, T. B. Edwards, M. E. Smith, and D. R. Best, "Revisiting the SO_4 Limit for the Defense Waste Processing Facility," pp. 213-22. in Ceramic Transactions*,* Vol. 176. Edited by C. C. Herman, S. L. Marra, D. R. Spearing, E. R. Vance, and J. D. Vienna. American Ceramic Society, Baltimore, MD, 2005.

22. R. W. Goles, J. A. Del Debbio, R. J. Kirkham, B. D. MacIsaac, J. A. McCray, D. D. Siemer, and N. R. Soelberg, "Test Summary Report INEEL Sodium-Bearing Waste Vitrification Demonstration RSM-01-2." PNNL-13869. Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA, 2002.

23. R. W. Goles, J. M. Perez, B. D. MacIsaac, D. D. Siemer, and J. A. McCray, "Test Summary Report INEEL Sodium-Bearing Waste Vitrification Demonstration RSM-01-1." PNNL-13522. Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA, 2001.

24. P. Hrma, C. E. Goles, and D. D. Yasuda, "Drainage of Primary Melt in A Glass Batch," *Nuclear Waste Management IV,* 23 361-67 (1991).

25. P. A. Smith, J. D. Vienna, and P. Hrma, "The Effects of Melting Reactions on Laboratory-Scale Waste Vitrification," *J Mater Res,* 10[8] 2137-49 (1995).

26. P. Hrma, J. D. Vienna, and J. S. Ricklefs, "Mechanism of Sulfate Segregation during Glass Melting," pp. 147-52. in Scientific Basis for Nuclear Waste Management XXVI*, Vol. 757. Materials Research Society, 2003.

27. J. G. Darab, D. D. Graham, B. D. MacIssac, R. L. Russell, H. D. Smith, J. D. Vienna, and D. K. Peeler, "Sulfur Partitioning During Vitrification of INEEL Sodium Bearing Waste: Status Report." PNNL-13588. Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA, 2001.

28. J. D. Vienna, W. C. Buchmiller, J. V. Crum, D. D. Graham, D.-S. Kim, B. D. Macisaac, M. J. Schweiger, D. K. Peeler, T. B. Edwards, I. A. Reamer, and R. J. Workman, "Glass Formulation Development for INEEL Sodium-Bearing Waste." PNNL-14050. Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA, 2002.

29. J. D. Vienna, P. Hrma, W. C. Buchmiller, and J. S. Ricklefs, "Preliminary Investigation of Sulfur Loading in Hanford LAW Glass." PNNL-14649. Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA, 2004.

30. K. Papadopoulos, "The solubility of SO_3 in soda-lime-silica melts," *Phys Chem Glasses,* 14[3] 60-65 (1973).

31. H. Li, P. Hrma, and J. D. Vienna, "Sulfate Retention and Segregation in Simulated Radioactive Waste Borosilicate Glass," pp. 237-46. in Ceramic Transactions*, Vol. 119. American Ceramic Society, Westerville, OH, 2001.

32. M. Ooura and T. Hanada, "Compositional Dependance of Solubility of Sulphate in Silicate Glasses," *Glass Technol,* 39[2] 68-73 (1998).

33. A. D. Pelton, "Thermodynamic calculations of chemical solubilities of gases in oxide melts and glasses," *Glastechnische Berichte,* 72[7] 214-26 (1999).

34. H. D. Schreiber and M. E. Stokes, "Enhancing the Sulfate Capacity of Glasses for Nuclear Waste Immobilization," *Journal of Undergraduate Chemistry Research*[2] 53-58 (2002).

35. D. K. Peeler, C. C. Herman, M. E. Smith, T. H. Lorier, D. R. Best, T. B. Edwards, and M. A. Baich, "An Assessment of the Sulfate Solubility Limit for the Frit 418 – Sludge Batch 2/3 System." WSRC-TR-2004-00081. Westinghouse Savannah River Company, Aiken, SC, 2004.

36. T. H. Lorier, I. A. Reamer, and R. J. Workman, "Initial Sulfate Solubility Study for Sludge Batch 4 (SB4)." WSRC-TR-2005-00213. Westinghouse Savannah River Company, Aiken, SC, 2005.

37. D. Manara, A. Grandjean, O. Pinet, J. L. Dussossoy, and D. R. Neuville, "Sulfur behavior in silicate glasses and melts: Implications for sulfate incorporation in nuclear waste glasses as a function of alkali cation and V_2O_5 content," *Journal of Non-Crystalline Solids,* 353 12-23 (2007).

38. P. A. Bingham and R. J. Hand, "Sulphate incorporation and glass formation in phosphate systems for nuclear and toxic waste immobilization," *Materials Research Bulletin,* 43[7] 1679-93 (2008).

39. P. A. Bingham, A. J. Connelly, R. J. Hand, N. C. Hyatt, and P. A. Northrup, "Incorporation and speciation of sulphur in glasses for waste immobilisation," *Glass Technology: European Journal of Glass Science and Technology A,* 50[3] 135-38 (2009).

40. A. L. Billings and K. M. Fox, "Retention of Sulfate in Savannah River Site High-Level Radioactive Waste Glass," *International Journal of Applied Glass Science,* 1[4] 388-400 (2010).

41. I. S. Muller, I. L. Pegg, A. C. Buechele, H. Gan, C. Kim, S. T. Lai, G. del Rosario, and Q. Yan, "Glass Formulation and Testing with TWRS LAW Simulants." ORP-56328. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection, Richland, WA, 1998.

42. I. S. Muller, A. C. Buechele, and I. L. Pegg, "Glass Formulation and Testing with RPP-WTP LAW Simulants." ORP-56327. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection, Richland, WA, 2001.

43. I. S. Muller and I. L. Pegg, "Baseline LAW Glass Formulation Testing." ORP-55237. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection, Richland, WA, 2003.

44. K. S. Matlack, M. Chaudhuri, H. Gan, I. S. Muller, W. K. Kot, W. Gong, and I. L. Pegg, "Glass Formulation Testing to Increase Sulfate Incorporation." ORP-51808. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection, Richland, WA, 2005.

45. K. S. Matlack, W. Gong, I. S. Muller, I. Joseph, and I. L. Pegg, "LAW Envelope C Glass Formulation Testing to Increase Waste Loading." ORP-56323. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection, Richland, WA, 2006.

46. K. S. Matlack, W. Gong, I. S. Muller, I. Joseph, and I. L. Pegg, "LAW Envelope A and B Glass Formulations Testing to Increase Waste Loading." ORP-56322. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection, Richland, WA, 2006.

47. K. S. Matlack, I. Joseph, W. Gong, I. S. Muller, and I. L. Pegg, "Enhanced LAW Glass Formulation Testing." ORP-56293. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection, Richland, WA, 2007.

48. K. S. Matlack, I. Joseph, W. Gong, I. S. Muller, and I. L. Pegg, "Glass Formulation Development and DM10 Melter Testing with ORP LAW Glasses." ORP-56296. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection, Richland, WA, 2009.

49. I. S. Muller, K. S. Matlack, H. Gan, I. Joseph, and I. L. Pegg, "Waste Loading Enhancements for Hanford LAW Glasses." ORP-48578. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection, Richland, WA, 2010.

50. G. F. Piepel, J. M. Szychowski, and J. L. Loeppky, "Augmenting Scheffe linear mixture models with squared and/or crossproduct terms," *Journal of Quality Technology,* 34[3] 297-314 (2002).

22

51. G. F. Piepel, "A Component Slope Linear Mixture Model for Mixture Experiments, " *Quality Technology and Quantitative Management*, 4[3]:331-343 (2007).

51. J. A. Cornell, "Experiments with Mixtures," Third ed. John Wiley and Sons: New York, NY, (2002).

53. H. Li, J. G. Darab, D. W. Matson, P. A. Smith, P. Hrma, Y. Chen, and J. Liu, "Phosphate-sulfate interaction in simulated low-level radioactive waste glasses," pp. 141-48. in Scientific Basis for Nuclear Waste Management XIX*, Vol. 412. 1996.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Scatterplot Matrix of Component Concentrations (Normalized Mass Fractions) in the Modeling Dataset.

Figure 2. Comparison of $w_{SO_3}^{Melt}$ to $w_{SO_3}^{Bubb}$ (circles) and $w_{SO_3}^{Sat}$ (diamonds)

Figure 3. Comparison of Predicted and Measured $w_{SO_3}^{Pred}$ with 90% Prediction Intervals (wt%)

Figure 4. Comparison of Predicted $w_{SO_3}^{Pred}$ (Based Only on Crucible Scale Data) with the Measured Maximum Concentration of SO_3 in a Melter Test without Salt Accumulation ($w_{SO_3}^{Melt}$)

Figure 5. Effects of Component Concentration Changes on Predicted $w_{SO_3}^{Pred}$ at the Composition Region Centroid

Table 1. Summary of SO$_3$ Solubility and Melter Tolerance Data for Hanford Simulated LAW Glasses

Source	Saturation	Bubbling	Melter
Muller et al. 1998[41]	0	1[(a)]	0
Muller et al. 2001[42]	42	0	0
Muller et al. 2003[43]	55	1[(a)]	0
Matlack et al. 2005[44]	14	1	1
Matlack et al. 2006[45]	4	4	1
Matlack et al. 2006[46]	36	15	2
Matlack et al. 2007[47]	41	13	4
Matlack et al. 2009[48]	40	2	3
Muller et al. 2010[49]	30	1	2
TOTAL	263	38	13

(a) Glass compositions are reported in the document listed in the source column, while $w_{SO_3}^{bubb}$ values are reported by Matlack et al. 2005.[44]

Table 2. Component Concentration (Normalized wt% Without SO₃) Ranges in Simulated LAW Glasses

Component	Full Dataset (264)		Model Dataset (253)		
	Min	Max	Min	Max	Centroid
Al_2O_3	5.53	13.95	5.53	13.95	8.22
B_2O_3	3.98	16.06	3.98	16.06	9.84
BaO	0	7.90	0	0.01	0.00
Bi_2O_3	0	5.01	0	0	0
CaO	0	12.94	0	12.94	6.17
CdO	0	0.24	0	0.24	0.00
Cl	0	1.17	0	1.17	0.40
CoO	0	3.05	0	0	0
Cr_2O_3	0.01	1.00	0.01	1.00	0.26
Cs_2O	0	0.19	0	0.19	0.03
CuO	0	3.05	0	0	0
F	0	3.06	0	3.06	0.09
Fe_2O_3	0	13.54	0	13.54	2.04
Gd_2O_3	0	7.90	0	0	0
K_2O	0.11	8.34	0.11	8.34	1.18
La_2O_3	0	7.90	0	0	0
Li_2O	0	5.86	0	5.86	1.17
MgO	0	10.10	0	10.10	1.61
MnO	0	2.50	0	0.06	0.00
MoO_3	0	0.01	0	0.01	0.00
Na_2O	2.48	26.05	2.48	26.05	17.93

Component	Full Dataset (264)		Model Dataset (253)		
	Min	Max	Min	Max	Centroid
NiO	0	0.11	0	0.11	0.00
P_2O_5	0	3.08	0	3.08	0.15
PbO	0	0.07	0	0.07	0.00
Re_2O_7	0	0.10	0	0.10	0.02
Sb_2O_3	0	3.00	0	0	0
SiO_2	30.05	50.64	30.05	50.64	41.69
SnO_2	0	5.01	0	5.01	0.78
SrO	0	7.90	0	0.08	0.00
TiO_2	0	4.11	0	4.11	0.40
V_2O_5	0	4.39	0	4.39	0.69
ZnO	0	5.86	0	5.86	3.17
ZrO_2	2.62	9.02	2.62	9.02	4.14

Table 3. List of Model Components and Coefficients

Model Term	Coefficient
Al_2O_3	-2.091901
B_2O_3	3.0440748
CaO	4.4422886
Cl	-22.65353
Cr_2O_3	-13.14139
K_2O	0.615785
Li_2O	2.4739255
Na_2O	2.8972089
P_2O_5	4.606083
SiO_2	0.2407285
SnO_2	-1.775325
V_2O_5	7.5345478
ZrO_2	-1.871916
Others[a]	-0.280272
$Li_2O \times Li_2O$	260.20302

(a) Others is the sum of all components not

specifically listed as model terms (i.e., those

not anticipated to have a significant effect).

Table 4. Model Fit Summary Statistics

Summary Statistics	Value
N	252
p	15
Mean	1.004
R^2	0.8910
R_A^2	0.8846
R_P^2	0.8735

Table 5. Summary of Fit and Validation Statistics from Validation Group Fits

Statistics	All Data	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Mean
R^2	0.891	0.894	0.882	0.901	0.891	0.898	0.893
R_A^2	0.885	0.886	0.874	0.893	0.883	0.891	0.885
R_P^2	0.874	0.872	0.859	0.882	0.866	0.877	0.871
R_V^2	-	0.867	0.914	0.839	0.885	0.841	0.869

Table 6. Variance-Covariance Matrix for the Model Coefficients in Table 3

	Al_2O_3	B_2O_3	CaO	Cl	Cr_2O_3	K_2O	Li_2O	Na_2O	P_2O_5	SiO_2	SnO_2	V_2O_5	ZrO_2	Others	Li_2O^2
Al_2O_3	0.22796	-0.03783	-0.04513	-0.04826	-0.39151	0.02098	-0.06298	-0.07541	0.00495	0.00593	0.04426	-0.02055	0.02127	0.00042	-1.15644
B_2O_3	-0.03783	0.16549	-0.03276	-0.64684	-0.22540	-0.00329	-0.01250	0.02625	0.08083	-0.03710	0.05522	0.01019	0.01786	0.01591	0.98631
CaO	-0.04513	-0.03276	0.16990	-0.28707	0.18097	-0.03746	-0.32785	0.00582	0.10679	-0.01581	0.12314	-0.08879	0.04882	0.03159	4.44709
Cl	-0.04826	-0.64684	-0.28707	19.64980	6.27046	0.82383	3.61376	-0.54163	-1.48872	0.24399	-0.26150	1.52780	-0.85662	-0.11397	-58.9558
Cr_2O_3	-0.39151	-0.22540	0.18097	6.27046	26.83350	-0.36469	-1.18131	-0.36852	-0.99636	0.23161	-2.99819	-1.19464	-0.73188	-0.01766	0.80384
Li_2O	0.02098	-0.00329	-0.03746	0.82383	-0.36469	0.34136	0.45233	0.01943	-0.17977	-0.02992	-0.09920	0.20537	-0.05818	0.03152	-4.11758
K_2O	-0.06298	-0.01250	-0.32785	3.61376	-1.18131	0.45233	5.10860	0.16011	-0.59893	-0.11048	0.07775	0.32640	-0.14256	0.14457	-81.3584
Na_2O	-0.07541	0.02625	0.00582	-0.54163	-0.36852	0.01943	0.16011	0.09633	-0.00094	-0.03053	-0.00221	-0.04062	-0.04339	0.01919	0.98990
P_2O_5	0.00495	0.08083	0.10679	-1.48872	-0.99636	-0.17977	-0.59893	-0.00094	2.70174	-0.03085	0.21463	-0.21278	0.21784	-0.02541	8.91131
V_2O_5	0.00593	-0.03710	-0.01581	0.24399	0.23161	-0.02992	-0.11048	-0.03053	-0.03085	0.03806	-0.05104	-0.01344	-0.05906	-0.04455	0.26020
ZrO_2	0.04426	0.05522	0.12314	-0.26150	-2.99819	-0.09920	0.07775	-0.00221	0.21463	-0.05104	1.27896	0.27211	-0.09251	0.08384	-0.68944
SiO_2	-0.02055	0.01019	-0.08879	1.52780	-1.19464	0.20537	0.32640	-0.04062	-0.21278	-0.01344	0.27211	1.04019	-0.02304	0.04337	-2.68470
SnO_2	0.02127	0.01786	0.04882	-0.85662	-0.73188	-0.05818	-0.14256	-0.04339	0.21784	-0.05906	-0.09251	-0.02304	0.68582	0.07489	0.59040
Others	0.00042	0.01591	0.03159	-0.11397	-0.01766	0.03152	0.14457	0.01919	-0.02541	-0.04455	0.08384	0.04337	0.07489	0.09310	-1.66062
Li_2O^2	-1.15644	0.98631	4.44709	-58.9558	0.80384	-4.11758	-81.3584	0.98990	8.91131	0.26020	-0.68944	-2.68470	0.59040	-1.66062	1623.941

Table 7. Centroid Composition and Component Effect Slopes Calculated at the Centroid

Component	Centroid (wt%)	Slope (wt% SO_3/mass fraction)
Al_2O_3	8.222	-3.314
B_2O_3	9.844	2.322
CaO	6.170	3.721
Cl	0.399	-23.699
Cr_2O_3	0.262	-14.129
K_2O	1.184	-0.337
Li_2O	1.166	7.680
Na_2O	17.932	2.367
P_2O_5	0.155	3.662
SiO_2	41.694	-1.221
SnO_2	0.781	-2.746
V_2O_5	0.687	6.631
ZrO_2	4.136	-2.943
Others	7.369	-1.326

(a) The slope for Li_2O ranges from roughly

1.61 to 32.1 across the model validity range.